## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE WESTERN DIVISION

| JOHN W. ARCHER,  Plaintiff,  vs.  No. 15-cv-2676-SH  CITY OF MEMPHIS, JOSEPH PAYNE,  and LARRY WESTON,  Defendants.  ) |                           |                          |
|--|---------------------------|--------------------------|
| vs. ) No. 15-cv-2676-SH ) CITY OF MEMPHIS, JOSEPH PAYNE, ) and LARRY WESTON, )   | W. ARCHER,                |                          |
| vs. ) No. 15-cv-2676-SH ) CITY OF MEMPHIS, JOSEPH PAYNE, ) and LARRY WESTON, )   |                           |                          |
| ) CITY OF MEMPHIS, JOSEPH PAYNE, ) and LARRY WESTON, ) )   | Plaintiff,                |                          |
| ) CITY OF MEMPHIS, JOSEPH PAYNE, ) and LARRY WESTON, ) )   |                           |                          |
| and LARRY WESTON, )  |                           | No. $15-cv-2676-SHL/tmp$ |
| and LARRY WESTON, )  |                           |                          |
| )  | OF MEMPHIS, JOSEPH PAYNE, |                          |
| Defendants. ) )  | LARRY WESTON,             |                          |
| Defendants. )  |                           |                          |
| )  | Defendants.               |                          |
|  |                           |                          |
|  |                           |                          |

## REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

On October 8, 2015, Plaintiff John Archer, a resident of Como, Mississippi, filed a pro se complaint against his employer under Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, 42 U.S.C. § 2000e et (ECF No. 1.) Plaintiff paid the filing fee and blank seq. summonses were mailed to him from the Clerk of Court. However, as of March 10, 2016, the court docket did not reflect any returns on the summonses. Because it was unclear whether Plaintiff had properly effected service upon the defendants, the court held a status conference with Plaintiff on March 29, 2016. Plaintiff appeared at the status conference and stated that due to his current financial situation and his limited ability to represent himself, he was not in a position to move forward with prosecuting Plaintiff made an oral motion to dismiss his case his case. without prejudice.

As it appears that Plaintiff is unable at this time to proceed with his case, and because the motion was made prior to service of the complaint upon the defendants, it is recommended that the complaint be dismissed without prejudice pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 41(a).

Respectfully submitted,

s/ Tu M. Pham
TU M. PHAM
United States Magistrate Judge
March 30, 2016
Date

## NOTICE

WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER BEING SERVED WITH A COPY OF THIS REPORT AND RECOMMENDED DISPOSITION, ANY PARTY MAY SERVE AND FILE SPECIFIC WRITTEN OBJECTIONS TO THE PROPOSED FINDINGS RECOMMENDATIONS. ANY PARTY MAY RESPOND TO ANOTHER PARTY'S OBJECTIONS WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS AFTER BEING SERVED WITH A 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); FED. R. CIV. P. 72(b)(2); L.R. FAILURE TO FILE OBJECTIONS WITHIN FOURTEEN (14) DAYS 72.1(q)(2). MAY CONSTITUTE A WAIVER OF OBJECTIONS, EXCEPTIONS, AND FURTHER APPEAL.